

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

MARYANNE MCCAULEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.)	
)	FILE No. 4:22-CV-00913
ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE OF THE)	
STRUYK FAMILY TRUST and)	
BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, MARYANNE MCCAULEY, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, her Complaint against Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE OF THE STRUYK FAMILY TRUST and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE OF THE STRUYK FAMILY TRUST and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff MARYANNE MCCAULEY (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in St. Peters, Missouri, (St. Charles County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. In addition to being a customer of the public accommodation on the Property, Plaintiff is also an independent advocate for the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. Her motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to demonstrate the plausibility of Plaintiff returning to the Property once the barriers to access identified in this Complaint are removed in order to strengthen the already existing standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property. (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE OF THE STRUYK FAMILY TRUST (hereinafter “ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE”) is an individual who transacts business in the State of Missouri and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, ROSIE J. STRUYK, may be properly served with process at 11063 Viacha Drive, San Diego, CA 92124-3424.

9. Defendant, BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC (hereinafter “BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC”) is a domestic limited liability company that transacts business in the State of Missouri and within this judicial district.

10. Defendant, BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, may be properly served with process via its Registered Agent, to wit: c/o John T. Banjak, Registered Agent, 21 North Meramec Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63105.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

11. On or about August 9, 2022, Plaintiff was a customer at “Burger King”, a business located at 2882 Highway K, O’Fallon, MO 63368, referenced herein as “Burger King”. *See* Receipt attached as Exhibit 1. *See* Selfie attached as Exhibit 2.

12. Defendant, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE, is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that Burger King is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

13. Defendant, BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, is the lessee or sublessee of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action.

14. Defendant, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE, as property owner, is responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE, and a tenant allocating responsibilities for ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant’s requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior

portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See* 28 CFR § 36.201(b).

15. Plaintiff's access to Burger King and other businesses at the Property, located at 2882 Highway K, O'Fallon, MO 63368, St. Charles County Property Appraiser's property identification number A982001399 ("the Property"), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of her disabilities, and she will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

16. Plaintiff lives 5 miles from the Property.

17. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property are accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, to determine if and when the Property are made accessible and to substantiate already existing standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

18. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a return customer as well as for Advocacy Purposes, but does not intend to re-expose herself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

19. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer one time previously and as an independent advocate for the disabled, personally encountered many barriers to access the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged many barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury if all the illegal barriers to access

present at the Property identified in this Complaint are not removed.

20. Plaintiff became aware of all identified barriers prior to filing the Complaint and because Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property as a customer and advocate for the disabled within six months or sooner after the barriers to access are removed, it is likely that despite not actually encountering a particular barrier to access on one visit, Plaintiff may encounter a different barrier to access identified in the Complaint in a subsequent visit as, for example, one accessible parking space may not be available and she would need to use an alternative accessible parking space in the future on her subsequent visit. As such, all barriers to access identified in the Complaint must be removed in order to ensure Plaintiff will not be exposed to barriers to access and legally protected injury.

21. Plaintiff's inability to fully access the Property and the stores in a safe manner and in a manner which inhibits the free and equal enjoyment of the goods and services offered at the Property, both now and into the foreseeable future, constitutes an injury in fact as recognized by Congress and is historically viewed by Federal Courts as an injury in fact.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

22. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

23. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;

- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

24. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

* * * * *

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

25. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

26. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C.

§ 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

27. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

28. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

29. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

30. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

31. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in her capacity as a customer at the Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of her disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit her access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

32. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of her disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit her access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in

this Complaint.

33. Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying her access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

34. Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

35. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- (i) The total number of accessible parking spaces is inadequate and is in violation of Section 208.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. There are at least 52 total parking spaces at the Property (including the two spaces at the southeast corner of the Property), which requires a minimum of three (3) accessible parking spaces, but there are only two accessible parking spaces. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate

an available accessible parking space as such a small number of accessible parking spaces in a large parking lot increases the likelihood of there not being an available accessible parking space.

- (ii) There are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- (iii) There are no accessible parking spaces on the Property that have a sign designating an accessible parking space as “Van Accessible” in violation of section 208.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate a van accessible parking space.
- (iv) The two accessible parking spaces and associated access aisle have a running slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as Plaintiff’s wheelchair may roll down the slope while entering or exiting the vehicle.
- (v) The access aisle to the accessible parking spaces is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and

create an unlevel surface.

- (vi) The accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- (vii) The accessible parking spaces are not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp side flares in the accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle. Moreover, when the vehicle parks in this space, the vehicle blocks the accessible route to the ramp.
- (viii) In addition, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (ix) The two accessible parking spaces have vertical rises in excess of ¼ inch and is in violation of Sections 303.2 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as well

as make it difficult for Plaintiff to travel to the public accommodations offered at the Property.

- (x) There is a vertical rise at the base of the accessible ramp that is in excess of a $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch, in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property when using this accessible ramp as vertical rises on ramps are particularly dangerous as the surface of the ramp is already at a significant slope which increases the likelihood of the wheelchair to tip over due to the vertical rise.
- (xi) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

36. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

37. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

38. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

39. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Property into compliance with the ADA.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

41. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications since the parcel is valued at \$983,507.00 according to the Property Appraiser website.

42. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the Property is a Burger King restaurant, which is an international restaurant chain with thousands of locations across the world with \$1.81 billion in revenue in 2021.

43. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendants have available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction available from the IRS for spending money on accessibility modifications.

44. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property have been altered since 2010.

45. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

46. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that she will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

47. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

48. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC.

49. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLCs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

50. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLCs, to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants, ROSIE J. STRUYK, TRUSTEE and BMB MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff her reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and

- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: August 31, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of
THE SCHAPIRO LAW GROUP, P.L.

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro
Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.
State Bar No. 54538FL
The Schapiro Law Group, P.L.
7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A
Boca Raton, FL 33433
Tel: (561) 807-7388
Email: schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
MARYANNE MCCAULEY